

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

JACK PARCHMENT, #36068-177,	§	
Movant,	§	
	§	
v.	§	3:10-CV-0681-N
	§	(3:06-CR-377-N)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.	§	

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE, AND
DENYING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

The United States Magistrate Judge made findings, conclusions and a recommendation in this case. Petitioner filed objections, and the District Court has made a *de novo* review of those portions of the proposed Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation (“FC&R”) to which objection was made. The objections are overruled, and the Court ACCEPTS the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge, and DENIES the motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* as moot.

Movant Parchment objects to the Magistrate Judge’s FC&R, arguing that the Court was not *required* to infer that possession of the firearm by the co-defendant was foreseeable. While that may be a correct statement of the law, Parchment nonetheless fails to offer any *facts* that would have caused this Court not to infer that possession of the firearm was foreseeable. *See* Motion Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 at ¶ 12(a) (Ground One supporting facts). The Court therefore overrules Parchment’s objection to the FC&R.

Considering the record in this case and pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22(b), Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing §§ 2254 and 2255 proceedings, and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c), the Court DENIES a certificate of appealability. The Court adopts and incorporates by


reference the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation filed in this case in support of its finding that the petitioner has failed to show (1) that reasonable jurists would find this Court's "assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong," or (2) that reasonable jurists would find "it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right" and "debatable whether [this Court] was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).¹

In the event, the petitioner/movant will file a notice of appeal, the court notes that

- () the petitioner will proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal.
- (X) the petitioner will need to pay the \$455.00 appellate filing fee or submit a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

SO ORDERED.

SIGNED May 21, 2010.


DAVID C. GODBEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Rule 11 of the Rules Governing §§ 2254 and 2255 Cases, as amended effective on December 1, 2009, reads as follows:

(a) Certificate of Appealability. The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant. Before entering the final order, the court may direct the parties to submit arguments on whether a certificate should issue. If the court issues a certificate, the court must state the specific issue or issues that satisfy the showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). If the court denies a certificate, the parties may not appeal the denial but may seek a certificate from the court of appeals under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22. A motion to reconsider a denial does not extend the time to appeal.

(b) Time to Appeal. Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a) governs the time to appeal an order entered under these rules. A timely notice of appeal must be filed even if the district court issues a certificate of appealability.